



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,745	01/10/2001	John Rozen	11125-017001	8043
26161 7590 01/27/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
BARQADLE, YASIN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2456				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/27/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES

6
7 *EX PARTE* JOHN ROZEN

8
9 Appeal 2008-3265
10 Application 09/757,745
11 Technology Center 2400
12

13 Oral Hearing Held: December 11, 2008
14

15 Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, ST. JOHN COURTENAY III, and
16 CAROLYN D. THOMAS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

17
18
19 APPEARANCES:

20 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

21 Faustino A. Lichauco, Esquire
22 FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
23 225 Franklin Street
24 Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2804
25
26

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Monday, December
2 11, 2008, at The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street,
3 Alexandria, Virginia, before Janice A. Salas, Notary Public.

4 THE CLERK: Calendar number 33, Mr. Lichauco.

5 MR. LICHAUCO: May it please the Board, my name is Faustino
6 Lichauco. I represent the assignee of record, Clearly Technologies, in
7 connection with the appeal. I'd like to drop -- I'd like to draw -- proceed
8 right away to the claim language at issue.

9 In attempting to determine whether a claim reads on a reference or
10 whether a reference anticipates a claim, it's useful to identify the players in
11 the claim and try to see where they are in the reference. In this case it's easy.
12 There are only three main players in our method claim. We've got the client,
13 the content server, and the origin server.

14 There's not a lot of dispute about the first two. The client clearly will
15 correspond to -- let me draw the Board's attention to figure 8, the user
16 terminal device 10A at the top of the figure. That would be the client.

17 The content server, again there's not much dispute on this. It would
18 correspond to the information distribution device at the bottom of the figure.

19 The controversy and the question for the Board this afternoon is
20 where is the origin server that receives a request from the client for a certain
21 desired content. Now, as best understood from reviewing the examiner's
22 remarks, the examiner regards this origin server as being the communication
23 network exchange device, number 20 in the figure.

24 It is true that that device is connected to the client, so there is the
25 possibility of communication between them, but in our review of Hasebe, it

1 appears to us that that device is simply a router and that in fact it does not
2 receive a request from the client for desired content.

3 Again, referring to figure 8, I would, if the Board permits, describe --
4 I'd like to describe how we see the device as working. How we see Hasebe's
5 -- the system as working. The process begins when the user terminal device
6 sends a data packet to the router 20. That data packet has along with it a
7 dotted quad address or an IP address.

8 The router then looks up in its routing table the proper place to send
9 the data packet.

10 So for example, if the user terminal device wants to send the packet to
11 the address 192001, which is in the figure, the router looks up in its routing
12 table and learns any data packet that wants to go to that address must be sent
13 to router at 40A, and it proceeds to do so, and that would send the data
14 packet to the router 40A, which is a little further down in the figure.

15 Then that router, which is also called a communication network
16 exchange device 40, would do the same thing. It looks up in its table where
17 to send the data packet next, and as one can see, it sees a data packet
18 intended for 192001 and it sends that to router 60A.

19 Having done that, the data packet now arrives at the bottom of the
20 page to its final destination, which is the information distribution device
21 60A.

22 The figure's a little simplified. It shows two layers of routers, but one
23 can imagine that there might be several layers of routers, each one sent
24 looking up where to send the data packet and then sending it in the next hop
25 or next stage of its journey from the client to the content server.

1 So it's apparent from that -- that description of how the Hasebe device
2 works that there is never a point at which the content serv -- at which the
3 origin server, namely, the router 20A, would receive a request from a client
4 for any desired content.

5 JUDGE COURTENAY: As a matter of claim construction, what's the
6 broadest reasonable construction of an origin server in a manner that's
7 consistent with your specification? This is the server where an original Web
8 page is located. Is that your construction or --

9 MR. LICHAUCO: Well, in construing the claim, giving it the
10 broadest reasonable interpretation, one is supposed to think of how one of
11 ordinary skill would understand it from the spec, and in the spec we do
12 describe certain properties of the origin server.

13 For example, in the background, first couple of paragraphs, we talk
14 about how the origin server contains Web pages.

15 It sends the Web pages to the user. We also clearly distinguish
16 between origin servers and routers. For example, in the -- I believe on page
17 1 on line 18 or so we talk about how one of the problems with content
18 delivery is that the origin server faces router congestion, and this in fact is
19 one of the -- one of the things that our invention is intended to overcome.

20 So the specification does clearly indicate that there is a difference
21 between an origin server and simply a -- what is simply a router. There are a
22 number of other examples of what the origin server has to be from the
23 specification. It's something that determines which autonomous system
24 would have the shared content. That's on page 6, lines 14 to 15.

25 It looks up shared addresses of autonomous system. That's on page 6

1 also, line 16. So there's certainly a lot of material that would suggest to one
2 of ordinary skill in the art that the origin server is not a router. So -- now,
3 there are a couple of other things that seem to fall apart in the claim when
4 we understand how Hasebe really works.

5 For example, there is never a step -- the claim requires a step of
6 providing the client with a shared address in response to the request that was
7 referred to in the first paragraph of the claim. Well, that never happens
8 because the client already has the shared address to begin with.

9 JUDGE BARRY: Counsel, where in your briefs does this argument
10 appear so we can follow along?

11 MR. LICHAUCO: This argument concerning the fact that the shared
12 address is not provided to the -- to the client is actually one that I discovered
13 just yesterday.

14 JUDGE BARRY: Okay. We can't consider that, then, counsel, at this
15 point.

16 MR. LICHAUCO: Well, it's also the case that there -- although there
17 is an autonomous system, it does not have content servers that have a copy --
18 that each have a copy of the desired content. I believe this argument was
19 raised in the brief.

20 The closest thing to an autonomous system -- I'm talking now about
21 the claim limitation in response to the request identifying an autonomous
22 system having content servers, each of which has a copy of the desired
23 content, that limitation.

24 The closest thing in Hasebe to an autonomous system would be the
25 three information distribution devices, 60A through 60B -- 60C. Those all

1 have the same identical communication terminal ID; however, there is no
2 indication that those -- those structures, those information distribution
3 devices actually have the same content.

4 JUDGE BARRY: Once again, counsel, I'll ask you that question.
5 Where does the argument about the same content appear in your briefs?

6 (Pause in the proceedings.)

7 MR. LICHAUCO: Right on page 10 we discuss the autonomous
8 system.

9 JUDGE BARRY: This is 10 of the --

10 MR. LICHAUCO: Of the --

11 JUDGE BARRY: -- supplemental brief?

12 MR. LICHAUCO: It's entitled -- it's entitled Brief on Appeal.

13 JUDGE BARRY: Okay. The brief on appeal is no longer before us.
14 That was replaced by supplemental brief on appeal.

15 MR. LICHAUCO: Oh, really?

16 JUDGE BARRY: Yes, so that's, for all intents and purposes, not part
17 of the record anymore. It was defective.

18 MR. LICHAUCO: So it appears, then, that we would not be able to
19 rely on that particular missing feature in Hasebe.

20 JUDGE BARRY: Right.

21 MR. LICHAUCO: Is that the case?

22 JUDGE BARRY: That's correct.

23 MR. LICHAUCO: All right. So we have basically two arguments
24 which are of record, and these relate to whether or not the Hasebe system
25 discloses an origin server, and if so, whether or not that origin server carries

1 out the function recited in the first full paragraph of claim 1.

2 Those in themselves are sufficient to distinguish this claim from the
3 prior art without the additional -- without having to consider the fact that the
4 reference does not have a number of other limitations.

5 So that's pretty much what I'd like to rest the appeal on. The fact that
6 Hasebe does not teach an origin server as that term would be understood by
7 one of ordinary skill in the art. All it teaches is a router.

8 In fact, what it teaches is a whole system of routers that direct a data
9 packet from one place to another. There is no communication back to the --
10 back to the client from the alleged origin server.

11 JUDGE BARRY: Any questions?

12 MR. LICHAUCO: Are there any questions?

13 JUDGE COURTENAY: Well, even if we adopted a broader
14 construction construing a server, an origin server, as broadly a provider of
15 services, it's still your position that the router is not an origin server, the
16 router in the reference there?

17 MR. LICHAUCO: Yes. There are two separate and independent
18 arguments. First, is the origin server -- sorry -- is the network exchange
19 device or router, can that reasonably be construed as an origin server, and
20 secondly, if so, does it in fact carry out the function of receiving a request
21 from a client for desired content.

22 Now, in -- I might draw attention to the fact that the case that talks
23 about the broadest reasonable interpretation is actually talking about the
24 broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim as a whole and not to
25 individual claim terms, so in considering that and in considering the extent

1 of origin server, I would ask the Board to note that.

2 JUDGE BARRY: Thank you for your time.

3 MR. LICHAUCO: Thank you.

4 JUDGE BARRY: We're off the record.

5 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded on December 11,
6 2008.)